

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ARNITHA HILL, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-01625-DAD-AC

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND GRANTING
DEFENDANT CITY OF SACRAMENTO'S
MOTION TO DISMISS

(Doc. Nos. 5, 14)

Plaintiff Arnitha Hill, proceeding *pro se*, initiated this civil action on September 16, 2022. (Doc. No. 1.) This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On December 20, 2022, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that the motion to dismiss filed on behalf of defendant City of Sacramento (Doc. No. 5) be granted and that plaintiff's complaint be dismissed with leave to amend. (Doc. No. 14.) The findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within twenty-one (21) days after service. (*Id.* at 16.) To date, no objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed, and the time in which to do so has now passed.

////

////

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a
2 *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the
3 findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.

4 Accordingly:

- 5 1. The findings and recommendations issued on December 20, 2022 (Doc. No. 14)
6 are adopted in full;
- 7 2. Defendant City of Sacramento's motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 5) is granted;
- 8 3. Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed, with leave to amend;
- 9 4. Within thirty (30) days from the date of this order, plaintiff may file a first
10 amended complaint; and
- 11 5. This action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further
12 proceedings.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: February 13, 2023

15 
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28